WSIS+20 Outreach Network GDC Zero Draft Webinar 1

April 17 2024

Carlos Reyes: Hello and welcome to the first of two interactive webinars about the Global Digital Compact Zero Draft organized by the WSIS+20 Outreach Network. My name is Carlos Reyes. In my support role for the network, I will be facilitating this webinar with the technical help of my colleague [name] and this is the agenda for today. The webinar begins with some level setting, then four discussants Jordan Carter, Amrita Choudhury, Fiona Alexander, and Veni Markovski will share their observations of the Zero Draft. The rest of the time will be dedicated to a discussion. Please use the question and answer pod or raise your hand and we'll do my best to manage the view. Thank you for joining and please welcome Elizabeth Oluoch who will provide at the level setting for today.

Elizabeth?

Elizabeth Oluoch: Thanks so much, Carlos. Hello, everyone. It's really good to see some familiar faces here online. Some of the participants on this call I know may be quite familiar with the digital cooperation process, and then some perhaps recently began following the GDC process. So, we thought it might be useful to provide some context before the discussion begins on the Zero Draft of the GDC, which, as many of you know, was published just a couple of weeks ago on April 1. The GDC evolved from the digital cooperation process, which was set in motion in 2018 by the UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres, just a year after he took office. He brought together a diverse group of individuals from the private sector governments and international organizations to form a high level panel on the corporation. The panel chairs were Melinda Gates and

Jack Ma. And the objectives of this panel was to raise awareness of the impacts of digital technologies, and advanced some proposals for digital cooperation.

In the following year, in 2019, the panel releases a report titled The Age of Digital Interdependence, which focused on several issues such as the digital divide, the impacts of digital technologies on human rights, and strategies to promote digital cooperation. The report highlighted gaps in the current global digital cooperation architecture. What we see emerging is a new process dealing with a broad set of digital and Internet related issues that are similar to the set of issues on the WSIS framework, issues of connectivity, the role of technologies on society, human rights, trust and security, but also a spotlight is placed on the IGF.

The report makes five recommendations, in particular a recommendation to promote digital cooperation. The panel report suggests that the Secretary General should also start a cooperative process to update the mechanisms for global digital cooperation. member states are receptive to the panel's report and want to discuss the issues further. This resulted in the follow up roundtables and digital cooperation where they discussed the recommendations and the panel's report and really ways to advance them. There were roundtables on global connectivity, digital public goods, digital inclusion, the digital texture, just to name some of them.

Because these roundtables are not limited to just governments, private sector organizations and international organizations can participate. Year long discussions were held in the roundtables. I know some of the participants, and some of you who have joined in this call participated in some of those roundtables. The roundtables generated more ideas that were action oriented.

And, in 2020, the secretary general issues the Roadmap on Digital Cooperation report. This report included action oriented recommendations in various areas such as achieving universal connectivity by 2030, and establishing a more effective architecture for digital cooperation. At this point, various models and suggestions for the IGF are also presented in this roadmap report.

So, in 2020, if you recall, the world is faced with a global pandemic. This is also the year of the UN 75th anniversary. The UN General Assembly hears from the Secretary General that the progress on some of the achievements of the SDGs may have been rolled back, and concerns emerge on whether the SDGs can be matched by 2030

In 2021, the Secretary General releases the Common Agenda Report with some action oriented ideas to address the global challenges seen as impacting the achievement of the SDGs. The Common Agenda Report outlines several digital issues and suggest that there should be a Global Digital Compact, adopted at the Summit of the Future. That GDC would reflect principles for an open, free, secure and digital future.

In 2022, the UN General Assembly adopts a resolution and the modalities for the Summit of the Future. During the same year, the Secretary General appoints co-facilitators, ambassadors from Sweden and Rwanda, to lead the intergovernmental process on the GDC. Several informal consultations and deep dives are held in 2023. member states and stakeholders participate.

In 2023, the Secretary General also issued a Policy Brief 5 on the Global Digital Compact, which introduces a proposal for establishing Digital Cooperation Forum that could serve as a mechanism on the follow up on the review and implementation of the GDC commitments. The GDC is expected to be in an annex in the Pact of the Future. We should note that this is an intergovernmental process and negotiations begin this year on the Path to the Future and the GDC.

I thought it might be helpful just to give a quick overview on some of the process of modalities. The GDC is an intergovernmental process as I just mentioned, it's a consensus document to be negotiated by member states. It'll be in the annex of the Pact of the Future, which is a separate negotiation process, and I believe today is the reading on the Zero Draft of the Pact of the Future. Zero Draft readings on the GDC will be held on May 2 and 3 as far as we know, this is member states only. The Co-facs, however, will be meeting with stakeholders on the 24th of April on the Zero Draft of the GDC.

So this is just a really quick overview. And I hope that this was useful as you begin your discussion.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you so much, Elizabeth, for that overview. It's helpful to understand the context. We will now return to the agenda and as I mentioned, the next section will be dedicated to observations from for discussions. We begin with Jordan Carter, Jordan, over to you.

Jordan Carter: Thanks, Carlos. And good morning, afternoon, evening. whatever time of day it is, wherever you are, it's nice to be here. And thanks to ICANN for organizing these chances for us to have a bit of a discussion here. I'm going to be fairly brief because I think the interesting thing here is the teasing out of perspectives between people.

So I think I will start with some positives in this draft. Overall, from our point of view, and sorry, just before I do kick off, Jordan Carter here from the dot AU domain administration. I have a number of different hats in the ICANN and Internet governance environment, but it's just important to stress that my comments tonight are personal ones from an outside perspective. I'm not representing the CCNSO or any other part of the ICANN community.

But to go into that positive the Global Digital Compact Zero Draft I think is better than we expected. It's relatively focused, it has some fairly concrete objectives. And

compared to some of the fears that we might have had around the draft coming out in the absence of seeing it, there are some good things, and one of those is that, unlike some of the earlier documents in this process, the technical Internet community is recognized as a key stakeholder. That wasn't something that we could take for granted, and it's really nice to see that the co-facilitators who prepared this draft have acknowledged that importance of the work that we do at ICANN in our associated communities. The second thing that I acknowledged as a win is that some of the institutional innovations that have been proposed in suggestions like the Secretary General's policy brief last year in May haven't been included in this draft Key among them, the digital Cooperation forum that had been proposed. That's a positive for us because that was an intergovernmental forum that could have taken away momentum and energy from the Internet Governance Forum which is a key multistakeholder Internet governance institution. And as part of that, not being in the draft, there was a number of calls in it to build upon existing Internet governance processes, which was welcome because it shows an instinct to say, let's amend it improve what's working today, rather than let's try and create something new. But there are a few issues and I'm only going to mention really a couple of these. The first is the arrival of a phrase called multi stakeholder cooperation, and of course, multi stakeholder cooperation, blending perspectives together as an important part of Internet governance and digital policymaking. But it isn't just cooperation that we do. If anyone described ICANN for example as a cooperation forum, they would only be telling a part of the story because it's fundamental to Internet governance, not just Internet cooperation. We make decisions, we implement them. We create processes that we then act upon. And that's governance. It's not just cooperation. So I think that the draft needs to talk about multi stakeholder governance and Internet governance, not just cooperation, and we're hoping that the people who are doing the job to work in the member states of the UN will take that observation into account.

And the second is the proliferation of new processes that are in this draft. And I've seen counts as wide as 12 and as heavy as five new processes here. There's some stuff on artificial intelligence which appears to replicate other existing AI UN tracks. And while there is that call I mentioned before, to build on and improve existing processes, the job doesn't go anywhere near as far as it could in actually doing that. And primarily among those things, is that it doesn't do a sophisticated or complete enough job at building on the World Summit on the Information Society, or WSIS, infrastructure and system in the UN, which is broadly speaking fairly multi stakeholder. And the United Nations Internet Governance Forum is one of those processes and is obviously a key multi stakeholder dialogue and Governance Forum.

So we think that as the draft as developed, there's a lot of work needed on this follow up institutions. For example, the proposal for a biennial high level meeting at the General Assembly to review progress on the GDC could probably be much better done and much more inclusively done as a high level track within each year's IGF, and the goals and targets included in the GDC draft could well be woven into updated action lines under the WSIS architecture.

So, you know, in a context where the UN system is struggling for resources, where facilities are closing, staff not being able to be hired, the idea of creating a new set of institutions and processes beside a set that already exist, and largely deal with a similar topic material, just doesn't make sense to us. So, quite a lot of work needed there.

And it's important that, as the negotiation proceeds, kind of preeminence and centrality of that WSIS architecture is achieved, rather than turning it, and other parts of the digital and Internet governance sphere, into spokes on a hub that's grounded in New York.

So, I hope that's given people a little bit of a perspective on it from our point of view and a few things to talk about. Thank you for the chance to join the meeting today. I look forward to seeing how their discussion proceeds, to your comments.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you, Jordan. We appreciate your contributions. Number two, Amrita Choudhury. Amrita go ahead.

Amrita Choudhury: Thank you so much Carlos for having me here. And obviously I would be speaking at my own capacity and not from At-Large or APRALO. I agree to most of the points which Jordan has made. In fact, if you look, the objectives and principles which has been laid out in the Zero Draft are very relevant, putting an emphasis on the human rights principle, or even recognizing the need for collaboration and the participation amongst all stakeholders to address the present challenges posed by the digital world, and how the GDC would achieve its goals is something which is good. Also recognizing that the different stakeholders such as the technical community is I would say a good move from a developing country perspective.

There are some welcome points in the GDC, such as focus on reducing the digital divide or inclusion, capacity building, skilling, the digital public infrastructure, or equitable technology access and transfer, or even using the AI for this. 13 page document has pretty good inputs also. However, there are concerns apart from the ones which Jordan shared. For example, there is no mention how the commitment to actions will be achieved and how to address the past mistakes, because most of the commitments mentioned in the draft, such as bridging the digital divide, or , adopting connectivity, or digital inclusion etc. are not something new. In fact, they have been discussed and are being discussed in many existing forums and processes, such as the the ITU, for example, and obviously, the various provisions for Call of Accountability, such as for the big tech information integrity, for example. How would that be ensured? While the document actually speaks about accountability? Who would ensure them? How would the companies be regulated? In fact, if they are not adhering to it, I think is missing.

Additionally, while you know the document recognizes all stakeholders, especially para seven, one and the multi stakeholder the importance of multi stakeholders, however, you there is a text which says cooperation will involve all stakeholders according to their respective mandates, functions and competencies. So from the civil society perspective,

the question arises, who decides the stakeholder groups competencies or functions because many different kinds of texts also sidelines civil society? So I think that's a tricky part how that could be addressed as a concern.

Similarly, the draft recognizes the need for multi stakeholder cooperation or partnership, but how these stakeholders cooperate and who will ensure it, is not mentioned. In fact, in several places, apart from government and private sector, there is no mention of, say for example, how civil society would be involved. One such example is para nine in terms of connectivity.

Also the while the Zero Draft recognizes and supports the IGF, it limits IGF relative to only the Internet related issues, and the technical layer. However, we all know that the discussions in the IGF is much more on digital issues and not just limited to technical issues or Internet related issues.

Also Jordan mentioned with the GDC fails to link with the WSIS processes, the SDGs and the IGF processes, which I think is crucial because all of these are kind of interlinked and intertwined. The duplication of several existing processes is also concerning, for example, creating a new panel on AI, or convening an inter governmental multi stakeholder process to develop and agree on the definitions and standards, or even setting up the high level review of the Global Digital Compact, establishing a dedicated office for coordinating digital and emerging technologies, etc.

In fact, many of the states in their interventions even on 5th April, have reiterated for the need of the GDC to utilize the existing UN processes. Even G77 reiterated this. There have been suggestions made even, perhaps suggested using the existing WSIS process, the idea of ecosystems etc, or the UN systems to support, monitor and implement the review of GDC.

Also, while you know the Digital Cooperation Forum is not mentioned, but the introduction of the high level review of the GDC brings in fear of a scope creep of the Digital Cooperation Forum, which initially when it was proposed was not supported even by the member states. In fact, there was a huge pushback.

So, since there are so many existing processes, it may also be cumbersome for member states to actually welcome another track are separate processes which they would have to adhere to, especially for developing countries who may have limited resources, and also, as Jordan elucidated, with UN facing financial crunch, attempting to create new structures would need funding, and I'm not sure whether it would be a welcome position by even member states.

So, rather than perhaps creating new processes, improving existing processes or enhancing and strengthening say, for example, the WSIS process or the IGF, whenever there are gaps to meet the existing requirements, or even improving and enhancing the

cooperative coordination between the existing UN systems and processes may be better.

So, these are few points which I thought I would bring to the consideration. Obviously, there's been a lot of discussion, and there will be more, but I limit it to this much. Thank you, Carlos and over to you.

Carlos Reyes: Thanks so much. I'm really appreciate your points and highlighting those issues. Let's move on now to Fiona Alexander. Fiona. Go ahead.

Fiona Alexander: Yes, hi everyone and thanks very much for the opportunity to provide some thoughts and reflections on the GDC, and probably agreeing with a lot of the comments that have been said so far, but just wanted to flag a couple other points and sort of contextual things to keep in mind.

So, the document that we're talking about today, and that everyone's reviewed, is the Zero Draft, which is just the beginning of a process of which most of us won't have any insight into exactly what's happening when and how. So, I think that's a part of the challenge for the stakeholder community, to keep up and keep track and figure out how and when to intervene, and even if there's an opportunity to.

So, I think it's important to keep in mind that we're talking about a document that probably has already been overtaken by events, in some cases with the member state feedback it's already gotten. So with that said, I think it's important to recognize that the Zero Draft reflects a lot of the feedback and comment and input that was received by governments and stakeholders in the deep dives last year, and in the earlier conversations this year that Elizabeth helpfully went over, and if you were just recently, from a pure ICANN, very narrow mission, DNS community perspective, I think the text around the Internet Governance Forum and around ICANN core issues is pretty good.

Actually, it's not bad when you look at it as a standalone. I think there's a couple of missed opportunities where on the connectivity section, there could be some references to internationalized domain names, which this community knows is important for meaningful connectivity. But it's not a crisis that it's not there. But it might be nice to see that if folks are interested in putting that there.

I think there's some challenges also, just around the broader connectivity section and missing some core institutions like the International Telecommunication Union that have been working on this issue, since its inception 158 maybe years ago now. So it's a little bit odd not to see it specifically highlighted. And then I think I found the AI stuff a little bit expansive and broad and premature.

Again, I'm not quite sure how core that is to the ICANN community, but it's important to keep in mind that I think there's a bit of an overreach in that second duplication. So

where I think there are some real challenges with the document, particularly with the follow up process that's put forward, and when I first read the document and did a first quick skim, I was like, oh, Internet governance stuff not so bad. Looks pretty good. I think we're in ok shape. But then, when you read those sections in the context of paragraph 61 through 65, I think we realized we have a bit more of a problem than I think folks had originally imagined.

So while, as Jordan said, there's no specific call for Digital Cooperation Forum in that name, when you read those paragraph 61 through 65, it says sort of a stealthy, or a little bit more not upfront way, to kind of create a similar kind of construct in some fashions, and really would push the centralization of UN work on digital stuff to New York away from the expert agencies, and away from stakeholder communities like ICANN, and could undermine IGF at some point, depending on the form and shape it takes. So I think the more I think about the text, those last sections are particularly problematic and deserve some real attention.

The other thing I just wanted to sort of flag and sort of throw out there for conversation amongst people that are interested in this issue set, is that is the question and conversation around having a conversation on tech, digital Internet, whatever you want to call it in New York, in the UN, versus the Geneva or other UN processes, and the Geneva processes are much more open, the ITU and other institutions have had stakeholders participate for a long time, in various uneven ways, but at least be able to be in the room. The New York processes, it really is an intergovernmental process, and I can't stress enough how much that means. It's hard for people that aren't governments to keep up with what's going on, which I think personally is quite a challenge.

And so I just wanted to sort of remind people, in bring people's attention back to what happened almost 20 years ago now with the World Summit on the Information Society. So WSIS obviously a summit in two phases, 2005, but there were a lot of preparatory meetings and a lot of negotiations that led up to those two big meetings of the summit, phase one, phase two. And, when these negotiations kicked off, in 2002, I believe, if my memory serves, stakeholders weren't allowed into the room. In fact, if I remember correctly, I think the ICANN CEO and staff at the time might have been forcibly removed from one of the meeting rooms at one point.

So I think we've come a long way in the 2002 to 2005 timeframe by insisting and pushing for more open processes, for stakeholders to at least be able to offer views at the beginning of negotiation sessions, and also be in the room or be aware or be able to watch what's happening. That was WSIS.

Then we have ITU which has its own work methods, and then we have the IGF which obviously is completely open. Now we come to the New York processes, and we look atWSIS+10 which had some great outcomes and some good advancements in this area. But I believe the New York processes were also too closed. And so I think the question I would sort of put to people, and it's the one that's kind of top of mind for me right now

is this an opportunity for the ICANN community or the Internet governance community, or the folks of interest on this call to kind of ask and push for a more open process in New York?

It's challenging, right? New York does a lot of conversations that are inherently governmental, that are geopolitical, and there's a lot of constraints around how to do that. Which gets to the point of is New York the right place to have these conversations, if you have those constraints.

So, I think it's worth thinking through as stakeholders, independently and collaboratively, talking about and seeing if there's a way to make these processes more open. If the New York UN system would like to continue to have conversations around digital issues, I think it's important that they talk about reforming their processes to let more people in. So, not specific to the GDC itself, but I think the GDC is a good example for that.

I'll leave it with that and sort of listen to what Veni has to say and then look forward to further discussions from people on the call that obviously we've had lots of views and are expert in this area.

Carlos Reyes: Thanks very much Fiona, andI appreciate the transition over to Veni Markovski. I did want to note that we received two questions in the q&a pod. We'll get to those during the discussion. Veni, over to you.

Veni Markovski: Thanks, Carlos. And thank you everyone so far speaking, and special thanks for all the 100 and plus people who joined, and I know for some of you it's not a very comfortable timezone. And I hope that tonight, my time, tonight, we'll have the same people.

Just wanted to remind everyone where we started from in this process. The GDC, in particular, was a UN Secretary General policy brief published last year, which I wrote on the ICANN website, which my colleagues will put in the chat so people can be reminded where it all started, this conversation about the GDC, with regards to the actual text and what should be in the text, you may remember that there were some factual inaccuracies about ICANN mentioned in this policy brief. It's good to see that have evolved with the GDC itself. Also the Tech Envoy, UN Secretary General's Tech Envoy last year, I believe it was the EuroDIG, me ntioned that the technical community is not a separate stakeholder in the GDC process, it's part of civil society. Good to see that the GDC is actually, they think that the technical community is a separate stakeholder. By the way, that statement by the Tech Envoy caused publication by APNIC, ARIN and ICANN, at the CEO level to explain the value of the technical community.

And then, of course, some people already mentioned the Digital Cooperation Forum, which was one of the proposals in the policy paper, which was supposed to be a multilateral gathering, annual gathering at the UN General Assembly. For those of you

who are not familiar with the language, that means that no other stakeholders will be allowed because, under the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, only member states can participate in such events.

So, I will cut my intervention short because I want to hear more from other people, just wanted to mention a couple of items. First, we have published also a WSIS+20 paper last year, an information paper, it's only four or five pages. It's very good to people who want to take a look at not only from ICANN's point of view, but in general, what's happening in the WSIS process, which the GDC is, even though it's a separatopic. we're considering that there are some elements that kind of connect the two processess. I mean the GDC mentioned the World Summit on the Information Society, support the IGF, the multi stakeholder model etc. So there is clear connection.

Then, just FYI, ICANN, together with the ITU, did a briefing for UN diplomats and people from the Secretariat in January, did it on January 11. At the same time, I'm sorry, at the same day, but obviously different times, around noon New York, and around noon in Geneva. And in New York, we were co hosted by the permanent missions of Guatemala and Bulgaria. And altogether in the two venues we have more than 100 missions participating. We did talk to them about how the Internet is functioning, and how we can connect the next billion using some of the items that I think Fiona mentioned, like universal acceptance. internationalized domain names. Very informative sessions, lots of questions, lots of high level officials, including ambassadors, participating.

So, we did this way of reaching out and briefing diplomats in New York and in Geneva is very helpful. They go behind closed doors for the negotiations of the GDC which will be taking place in May and June, that they actually have the knowledge about how the Internet functions and they could make sure that there are no texts which undermine the single interoperable Internet.

Everyone, I'm looking forward to the discussion.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you, Veni. And thank you to the four discussants for getting this discussion started. Let's move on to the interactive portion. As I mentioned, we have a q&a pod, we have two questions. But you're also welcome to raise your hands. So, perhaps, as you contemplate your question, I'll start with the first question in the q&a podm we received from [name] , how does the GDC draft balance cybersecurity efforts with concerns about potential impacts on freedom of expression and privacy? Does anyone have some thoughts on that in the discussions or perhaps someone from the audience.

Thank you, Carlos. And just to respond to the question. At a higher level, the GDC does have a lot of emphasis on open trusted Internet, information security, data security, etc. As well as, the use of the AI governance etc. However, the main emphasis it gives is on human rights. So the, when you're talking about human rights, etc, the freedom of expression does come into force. So yes, there is emphasis on that, so directly, it's not

talking about cybersecurity, but it talks about data security, information, security, trusted secured networks, etc. So, it does talk about that. And privacy, obviously, and human rights is there. The privacy aspect is also spoken on the data privacy part. So, yes, it is there.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you Amrita, let's ask the audience if there's any other questions before I go to the second one in the Pod. Would anyone like to raise their hand?

Okay, I'll read the second question then. Governance and competition becoming cooperation is one. Competitive governance is another GTC assure competitive governments.

Veni?

Veni Markovski: I'm not sure what exactly the question is. Maybe whoever asked it could expand it a little bit

Carlos Reyes: Gopal Tadepalli. If you're able to unmute, perhaps you can expand on your question for the group.

Gopal Tadepalli: Thank you. Good evening. Governments of a given region, with governments of other regions is something that I've been thinking about. Regional boundary is...

Carlos Reyes: It seems we lost Gopal. Let's move on to the next question.

Gopal Tadepalli: [inaudible]

Veni Markovski: You're breaking a lot. And your question is breaking. Maybe you can write it down in the chat or q&a, so we can answer and in the meantime, I see Fiona may have some answer.

Fiona Alexander: I'm just gonna take a stab at what I think maybe the questioner was getting at, but I think he was trying to ask a question with respect to regional approaches to does the GDC sort of talk about regional competition with different approaches, and it doesn't because it is really talking about how to build a global digital world and a shareable world. It doesn't really get into sort of regional differences or regional approaches. So that set of issues which is the big one is not actually covered in this process. We're asking so just offer that

Carlos Reyes: Thank you, Fiona for taking a stab at that. And I see Chris Buckridge has his hand up, Chris?

Chris Buckridge: Yeah, thanks, Carlos. I mean, I was gonna take a little stab as well, just sort of building on what Fiona was saying. And because we had a bit of a discussion about this in earlier webinar, it we're looking I think part of what we need to look at here is how we build the case for the stakeholder, Internet governance that had approach and one of the really key things that the IGF has gotten per system, this network of national and regional initiatives throughout the world which are not governed in a top down way, but are actually developed organically, to allow people to have that sort of much closer to home and discussion with people in their own networks and in their own areas. So I mean, I think as we look to making that compelling argument as to why the existing structures and particularly the multistakeholder existing structures are superior and can do the job. This relation to national and regional empowerment and agency is a really key part of that argument, I think, thanks.

Carlos Reyes: Thanks to Chris, for providing that input. There's another question in the q&a pod, from [name] Bangladesh. I would like to tell more about multi stakeholder partnerships among government researchers in academia. The current context for AI for everyone.

Are there any observations in response to Aki core.

Jordan Carter: Just really to say I think that's probably out of scope of the expertise of the people on the call today, and as an AI matter.

Carlos Reyes: Thanks, Jordan. Let's move on. I actually I see that Gopal has provided some context there. I'm sorry. Thank you, Fiona. "we want necessary and sufficient localization. We know at an a global scale, it runs the risk of becoming micro. So regional, and then global governance. A layered governance may be needed and how does it happen in GDC? " We'll give everyone some time to digest that. Many thanks.

Veni?

Veni Markovski: I think I mean, at least we are looking from the point of view of governance, whatever ICANN I mean, what the issues that ICANN see. It's a global governance of the Internet unique identifier systems, but actually there is a lot of national and internal governance of different issues related to the Internet, like apps and websites, etc. There are countries national laws that terminate in certain countries, like some countries have no regulation whatsoever on anything related to the Internet, others have laws related to content or to applications. So these are different topics when we are and I don't know that the GDC will actually get into these details, but also we have to remember many of the items that we may be thinking the GDC should be dealing with, actually is not going to do it because we have the WSIS process next year.The WSIS is the one that you know, the Tunis Agenda and the wizards plus 10 outcome document are the ones that provide a lot of information about governance of

the Internet, and therefore, if any changes are going to be proposed or any updates or upgrades to be done next year at the UN.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you very. Let's head over I see two hands now. Thank you for raising your hands. Let's go to Bill Drake and then [inaudible] .

William J. Drake: Hi everybody. So we had a webinar about this yesterday in my webinar series, which some of you attended, and I thought there was a good conversation about some of these points about follow up, and I just wanted to flag things that we chatted a little bit about with some which have been highlighted here as well by Fiona and others speaking up. I mean, I tend to think that with regard to the follow up stuff, they're going to really want to have something about AI. There's so many governments agitated about the need for something about AI if that ends up that they have to have a an expert panel kind of configuration that might not be so bad, but I don't know about the annual meetings, which could easily be very politicized. I mean, it just depends how that's configured. But I have bigger concern, which is that and I think Jim Pendergrast and other people have talked about this in the chat and Jorge mentioned this and one of the different this notion of the high level review every two years, and whether it doesn't seem to kind of echo the digital Cooperation forum by another name. It does seem potentially problematic to me to be building this capacity in New York, which is so inter governmental and politicized and tied to the General Assembly, etc. And I would say it's hard to argue that there shouldn't be any compact review mechanism, obviously, there has to be, but I think people have said, it could be proposed that this be done in the IGF are done even in the CSTD, one of the processes that's more open. I think that we were trying to mobilize some people to actually make interventions to that effect. And more importantly, because, obviously, governments matter more than what stakeholders, I have to say, to keep governments that can carry that certain into the process and maybe get them to think about recalibrating, and same thing with a sort of the office to coordinate everything in New York. I mean, I anybody who was involved in this processes 2018 and gone to all these meetings with the tech convoy and so on. It's been clear from the outset that they wanted to build stuff. And that I mean, the whole kind of incentive structure and going into these things, is to come out with a win, which is to have a an organizational unit with some FTAs and all that. But, I don't really it's not obvious to me, really what the coordination as needed, would constitute, and why this has to come from New York and why the kinds of coordination mechanisms that have already been put in place by leadership of the bodies involved in the with this couldn't be grown out. And so there's questions to be asked about this whole kind of moving stuff into the New York context, given the fact that they New York environment and I say this is somebody who lives in New York, unfortunately, is just not that hospitable to stakeholder engagement. They just don't have it in their culture in their bones, how to interact with stakeholders in a really meaningful way. Just holding these consultations for people get to make three, three minutes interventions. And there's no actual interaction dialogue. It's problematic to have all this stuff getting concentrated here. So I hope that people can come together around providing some organized feedback on those points. And I know we have this

constitution coming up on the 24th that they did not announce very well, well, but maybe people can make those points there, too. I'll stop there. Thanks.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you, Bill. Let's go back to the queue. We have Jordan and then Veni, and two questions on the q&a pod. Jordan, go ahead.

Jordan Carter: Thanks, Carlos. Just a couple of reflections on Bill and Fiona's points around follow up and others have echoed this as well. I think you know, there's the there's already a five yearly or 10 year the General Assembly lead review of WSIS, which looks at the kind of structure and goals of the initiative and then the more practical follow up and making sure that things are done, is done in that more multi stakeholder environment of the various WSIS initiatives. And I think we should be able to make the case that's a genuinely better way to do it, because it genuinely weaves in the perspectives and needs of the whole stakeholder community that they know even the GDC draft says is integral to actually delivering on the goals. So there's a positive case I think, to be made that it would genuinely be better to be more inclusive and to focus its implementation in those existing structures. And then if there was a need for a political oversight, I'm sure ever General Assembly review that haven't every five or 10 years just like it is for WSIS. And I just wanted to kind of note, I admire the call, Fiona, that you've made for the under processes in this GDC to be opened up. And I would love to see that happen and we'll be encouraging our government here in Australia to advocate that. I guess. So I feel that likely given the how woven in a very not open way of doing things this and that environment, but it also provides more impetus for us. All I think to argue that the Geneva based institutions are the better place for this to be happening. Thanks.

Thank you, Jordan. Veni?

Veni Markovski: [inaudible] mentioned something about the UN processes, because so many not be always aware. Yes, everything they you know, it's a cliche where everyone says in New York everything is very politicized. And in Geneva these are the subject matter experts. We talk about the WSIS though and the GDC. It's not a coincidence that this is happening in New York and not in Geneva. Because that's part of the work of the UN General Assembly,and I have to congratulate here the co-facilitators, because they actually managed to do more than anybody would have expected to try to hear what the other stakeholders have to say about the GDC. Usually, it's a UN General Assembly, it will be member states only, but you know, they did deep dives last year they were accepting and continue to accept comments, other stakeholders. We've mentioned the 24th of April session that they're also organizing, and anybody can find the information at the on the website of the Global Digital Compact and tech invoice page on the UN website. And we have to be aware that even though for us to come, you know with a background like the witnesses when they will we were kind of though in the beginning it was difficult to participate it kind of improved or with the ICANN fix sessions and Pelosi says I think it's important to understand that the UN General Assembly is not gonna change the procedure just because of this topic, digital corporation or says it doesn't matter. They will keep it because it combines years of experience or decades of

experience. And yet today and all member states have the right to decide in what form or shape they want to discussing. The Internet Governance Forum is not utilized to the extent it could we were reminded about it with a letter from the IGF leadership panel which was set up by the UN Secretary General. Last year they sent a letter to the facilitators and the Secretary General suggesting that there is no need to create a new structure and some of the panelists today they were saying that it seems like there is also no need to this two year review because the IGF could actually do this level view of the GDC. So it's on May 2 and third when the members get together. In New York behind closed doors and started discussing text by text the GDC to see how many of those proposals that have been sent out to them will actually made it in the next version of the draft then we'll see whether they're coming from all these discussions that you're having in any case, I agree with you on the GDC. We at least from point of view of Internet governance, the Go Internet resources and ICANN point of view is way more positive than it was, It sounded like a year ago.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you, Veni. Let's go to the next question in the q&a pod. Does the final version of the text need consensus among member states and what elements of pushback can be expected in the coming discussions? Amrita Go ahead.

Amrita Choudhury: This is speculation based on what we heard during the 5th April conversation when member states actually reiterated more on using the existing mechanism. So perhaps more discussion on you know how existing mechanisms etc can be used. Apart from other thing aspects such as, on digital public infrastructure or access etc, which have been discussed. Perhaps those would be them we think is perhaps that could be pushed because many member states actually reiterated that point. Even as I mentioned, G77, which normally doesn't, at times is not so proactive in this.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you. Amrita.

Fiona Alexander: I am just gonna try to answer [name] 's question that you put into the chat. And I can speak to this from my previous government experience. I'm obviously not participating in the current negotiations. But there are many people on the call the end in the chat or on the zoom that could maybe provide some perspectives that might have some more upside. But I always expect yes that the ultimate document will be adopted by consensus. I don't expect this will go down to a vote as other parts of the UN might do. So yes, I think bottom line consensus is what they're seeking what they're hoping to get. And I would assume there'll be pushback on there from various quarters about the duplication and using existing processes, a lot of the stuff that we're actually talking about here in different iterations. And then there could be some country specific or some geopolitical specific issues that are also get raised that we wouldn't necessarily think of. So again, others on the call who are participating as governments might have a little bit more insight to offer if they feel comfortable sharing. And I just wanted to while I'm speaking for a double back and reiterate that I do think for the ICANN community, and I'm not sure there's gonna be on the ICANN community potentially on the webinar,

but for that I can community I think the document compared to previous iterations of UN conversations around this space is actually quite good. Right. I mean, you are it isn't a good source issues. Again, I would think maybe there could be a reference to it ends if folks wanted to. But when I'm talking about sort of the concerns I have, it's about the broader ecosystem. And it's about the broader system that includes Internet Governance Forum. And things like that. So I just wanted to put that in context. And I appreciate the need and the goal, and the reasons are different institutions and different actors operate different ways, I think. But my observation over the years is that if you don't make the ask, and if you don't push for change, you will get change. I think even if we pushed for change, we shouldn't expect things will change in a month. But if you don't start having those conversations with your respective governments, who are the ones that are gonna be able to make those proposals and make that change, then nothing will happen.

Carlos Reyes: So thank you, Fiona. I saw a hand from Mallory Knodel. Thank you. She put her hand down.

Mallory Knodel: I did. A little sheepish about just tiny bit. One. What Fiona just said about it's an overall process document actually. True, because the Zero Draft maybe I misinterpreted. I meant the Zero Draft does actually call out specific issues. Somebody already mentioned shut down. It doesn't for example, mentioned censorship, even though it does talk about free expression. It talks about encryption. There are actually I think issues there and I've been trying to distill and I appreciate your talking about I can specific issues since and specific coordination group but is what are the issues that only governments really have the power to solve or can bring forward like there's a reason why we need governments involved in Internet governance. Because they have a lot of power and control of markets and things like that. And I do think that there are those issues that need governments to actually take control over and access as one so it's awesome to see that it's like the first cluster, but the other ones I think are shutdowns and censorship, restraints. I'll see. Another one and then lastly, I think which the co-facs are not necessarily keen to include even any mention of would be weapons in war, but it is something that continues to feature large easily and then press as we all know so yeah, I think those are the things we can actually pull up some issues

Carlos Reyes: Thank you Mallory, no need to feel sheepish. I think everyone values the contributions from the group. So thank you for speaking up. So let's go to one final question here from the q&a pod. And it's from [name] . And let me add that in the chat so that everyone can see if one of the commitments is promoting a trustworthy Internet commitment. May I request some enlightenment from the experts about the interventions for developing countries? Are there any observations about developing countries are participating specifically on that point or may participate? Amrita, go ahead.

Amrita Choudhury: So, when the... and this is based upon what we have seen and what we have seen so far, most developing countries agree that with the notion that we

need to have a trusted Internet, a safer space. That's the question out here and promoting a trustworthy Internet and we all know but apart from it, that have not been that many details. I'm not sure what aspects of the trustworthiness it is being spoken because there are discussions on data privacy in misinformation information except making this Internet safe for women children, etc. Gender based violence etc and all that stuff. So those are certain things which are there but if there is anything else, Hachiko Raman is asking I'm not too sure, but those are there mentioned.

 Thank you, Amrita. I appreciate the response there. We are at the top of the hour here and 30 seconds. So we'll wrap up. I'd like to thank Jordan, Amrita, Fiona and Veni for joining us as discussed since I'd also like to thank all of you for participating in this first of two webinars on GDC Zero Draft. We'll be back in about 10 hours at one UTC for the next webinar we have to discuss since returning and then to other discussing so thank you all for your contributions. I'll be sharing recordings on the WSIS+20 at ICANN, then we wish you good evening.

Carlos Reyes: Good day or good morning wherever you may be so thank you all.